

REMARKS

The Amendments

Claims 1 and 10-26 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10-26 stand rejected. Claim 1 is herein canceled without prejudice. Claim 21 is herein amended. New claims 27-36 are herein presented, and support for them is provided by the specification (such as at page 7 lines 7-26, Examples 1(A), 2(A), and 6) and by the originally-filed claims. No new matter is added by the new claims. Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and consideration of the below remarks. In light of these amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application.

Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. The Office Action alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “said signal.” Claim 21 has been herein amended to clarify the antecedent basis for this term. Applicants believe this rejection is now rendered moot and respectfully request its withdrawal.

Rejection of Claims 1, 10, 11-13, 14-16, 17, 19-20, 21-24, and 25-26 Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1, 10, 11-13, 14-16, 17, 19-20, 21-24, and 25-26 stand rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,300,068 alone or in combination with another document. Claim 1 has been cancelled. The rejection is therefore moot as applied to claim 1.

While not in agreement with the Office Action on this rejection, Applicants, in the interest of efficient prosecution of this application, herewith agree to submit a terminal disclaimer over U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,068 upon indication of allowable claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/29/05

By:



Lisa M.W. Hillman, PhD
Reg. No. 43,673